



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,101	12/20/2001	Clifford Lee Hannel	PA3545US	8647
22830	7590	09/15/2008		
CARR & FERRELL LLP			EXAMINER	
2200 GENG ROAD			LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
PALO ALTO, CA 94303				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2161		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/15/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/019,101

Applicant(s)

HANNEL ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P. LeRoux

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Status

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are pending. Claims 4 and 11-14 have been cancelled.

Lengthy Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is required in correcting any errors of which applicant may be aware in the specification. The specification of the present application comprises 126 pages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noble et al (US 5,634,053), hereinafter Noble in view of Elley et al (US 7,212,262), hereinafter Elley and further in view of Kerr (US 5,115,501), hereinafter Kerr.

Regarding claim 1, Noble discloses:

a virtual database service [col 4, line 63 through col 5, line 3]

comprising the virtual database table [col 5, lines 18-25],

wherein the virtual database table comprises one or more rows [col 5, line 20]

and each of the one or more rows comprises one or more fields [col 5, line 21];

wherein the virtual database service is configured to: receive the query; respond to the field name and the indication of the manner for selecting a row as required to obtain the information to be provided from the information source; and provide the information as a value of the field indicated by the field name in the selected row, in response to the query [col 5, line 60 – col 6, line 15]

Noble discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose an information source comprising the information to be provided in response to the query of the virtual database table, wherein the information source comprises an access evaluator configured to determine whether a user may have access to an information resource within the information source the query comprising a field name and an indication of manner for selecting a row. Elley discloses in column 1, lines 60-67:

The first question involves a process called client authentication. The second involves reference to an authorization decision mechanism, such as an Access Control List (ACL) maintained by the server and containing a list of individual clients and/or client groups who are permitted access to the resource. The present invention relates to the determination of group membership or group non-membership of the resource requesting clients. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Noble to include above limitation based on the teaching of Elley for the purpose of ensuring integrity of the information contained in the virtual tables by controlling access to the virtual tables.

Examiner Notes:

The claimed “access evaluator” has been interpreted according to the following which applicant provided in the response of 10/31/2007.

Before the access control system in which the present invention is implemented can grant a user access to an information resource, it must do two things: authenticate the user, that is, determine that the user is the entity it claims to be, and make a user group membership determination, that is, determine whether the user’s group membership are such that the access policies for the information resource permit the user to access the information resource.

The combination of Nobel and Elley discloses the manner of selecting a row including information identifying the information resource within the information source and the user seeking access to the information resource, the information provided in response to the query including an indication of whether the identified user may access the information resource [col 12, lines 48-55]

The combination of Noble and Elley discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose an additional information source configured for use as a user profile information source that provides additional information about the user through the use of profile information gathering that indicates to the user profile information source how to gather the profile information, the indication of the manner for selecting a row further including the profile information gathering information, wherein the information provided in response to the query is obtained at least in part from the profile information source, the provided information including the profile information. Kerr discloses an additional information source configured for use as a user profile information source that provides additional information about the user through the use of profile information gathering that indicates to the user profile information

source how to gather the profile information, the indication of the manner for selecting a row further including the profile information gathering information, wherein the information provided in response to the query is obtained at least in part from the profile information source, the provided information including the profile information [Fig 6]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include an additional information source configured for use as a user profile information source that provides additional information about the user through the use of profile information gathering that indicates to the user profile information source how to gather the profile information, the indication of the manner for selecting a row further including the profile information gathering information, wherein the information provided in response to the query is obtained at least in part from the profile information source, the provided information including the profile information as taught by Kerr for the purpose of customizing the search query.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Noble, Elley and Kerr discloses wherein the indication of the manner of selecting a row further includes comprises a selection value and the information source provides at least one component of the information to be provided in response to a match between the selection value and a pattern that matches a plurality of values and is accessible to the information source [col 10, lines 20-25]

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Noble, Elley and Kerr as applied to claim 1 and further in view of The Coldfusion 4.0 Web

Application Construction Kit, Third Edition by Ben Forta, Nate Weiss, Michael Dinowitz, Ashley King and Davis Crawford (hereafter Forta), Published December 23, 1998.

Claim 3:

The combination of Noble, Elley and Kerr discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose wherein the query is an SQL query addressing the database table; the field name is contained in a SELECT clause in the query; and the indication of the manner of selecting a row is contained in a WHERE clause in the query. Forta discloses wherein the query is an SQL query addressing the database table; the field name is contained in a SELECT clause in the query; and the indication of the manner of selecting a row is contained in a WHERE clause in the query [Listing 8.6 and Fig 8.20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include wherein the query is an SQL query addressing the database table; the field name is contained in a SELECT clause in the query; and the indication of the manner of selecting a row is contained in a WHERE clause in the query as taught by Forta for the purpose of selecting a table and filtering out the rows which are not of interest.

Claims 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Noble, Elley and Kerr as applied to claim 1 and further in view of US Pat No 5,504,890 issued to Sanford (hereafter Sanford).

Claim 5:

The combination of Noble, Elley and Kerr discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above and furthermore, Noble discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted

above but does not disclose the access evaluator determines whether the user may have access to the information resource by considering one or more access policies, each access policy indicating whether a user group may have access to a set of information resources and access by the user to the information resource being allowed when the access policies for the user groups to which the user belongs and the sets of information resources to which the information resource belongs so indicate; and the manner of selecting the row contains membership information about the user from which membership of the user in a user group may be determined. Sanford discloses the access evaluator determines whether the user may have access to the information resource by considering one or more access policies, each access policy indicating whether a user group may have access to a set of information resources and access by the user to the information resource being allowed when the access policies for the user groups to which the user belongs and the sets of information resources to which the information resource belongs so indicate; and the manner of selecting the row contains membership information about the user from which membership of the user in a user group may be determined [collaboration amongst contributors, col 2, lines 11-23]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include the access evaluator determines whether the user may have access to the information resource by considering one or more access policies, each access policy indicating whether a user group may have access to a set of information resources and access by the user to the information resource being allowed when the access policies for the user groups to which the user belongs and the sets of information resources to which the information resource belongs so indicate; and the manner of selecting the row contains membership information about the user from which membership of

the user in a user group may be determined as taught by Noble for the purpose of controlling access such data consistency can be maintained.

Claim 6:

The combination of Noble, Elley, Kerr and Sanford discloses the elements of claims 1 and 5 as noted above and furthermore discloses the access evaluator uses the membership information to determine membership of the user in a user group [Sanford: Fig 8, col 12, lines 4-16].

Claim 7:

The combination of Noble, Elley, Kerr and Sanford discloses the elements of claims 1, 5 and 6 as noted above and furthermore discloses the access evaluator determines that there may be a user group such that membership in the user group would give the user access to the information resource; and the provided information indicates a method of providing further information about the user in a further query from which the user's membership in the user group can be determined [Sanford: collaboration identification, col 7, lines 20-23].

Claim 8:

The combination of Noble, Elley, Kerr and Sanford discloses the elements of claims 1 and 4-7 as noted above and furthermore discloses the further information includes authentication information which may be used to validate the user's identity [Sanford: collaboration identity, col 7, lines 20-23].

Claim 9:

The combination of Noble, Elley, Kerr and Sanford discloses the elements of claims 1 and 4-8 as noted above and furthermore discloses an additional information source that is an

authenticator, the authenticator using the authentication information to validate the user's identity [Sanford: another collaboration identification, col 12, lines 35-41].

Claim 10:

The combination of Noble, Elley, Kerr and Sanford discloses the elements of claims 1 and 4-9 as noted above and furthermore discloses the response to the further query provides an indication whether the user's identity is valid [Sanford: Fig 8, col 12, lines 4-17].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of references is not proper.

Examiner is not persuaded. If applicant argues that there is no specific suggestion or teaching in the references to combine prior art, the examiner may respond that KSR forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. See recent Board decision *Ex parte Smith*, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007) (citing KSR, 82 USPQ2d at 1396)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Etienne P LeRoux/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161

9/12/2008